

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 30, 2005. Claims 1-17 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-10 were rejected, and Claims 11-17 were withdrawn from consideration. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicants amend Claims 1 and 5. Thus, Claims 1-10 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

RESTRICTION/ELECTION

Applicants confirm the election without traverse of Claims 1-10 for examination in response to the Examiner's restriction and request for election. Applicants acknowledge that Claims 11-17 are treated by the examiner as having been withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTION

The Examiner objected to Claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner states that the recitation of "a intrusion" in the preamble of Claim should be "an intrusion." Applicants have so amended the preamble of Claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that the amendment to Claim 1 is made for grammatical purposes only, is not made based on any cited reference and, therefore, does not narrow or otherwise change the scope of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the recitation of "each of the management node" renders the claim indefinite because "a management node" was recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Nevertheless, Applicants have amended Claim 5 to remove one

recitation of the word “each” from Claim 5. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,905,859 issued to Holloway et al. (hereinafter “*Holloway*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claim 1 is independent. Applicants respectfully submit that *Holloway* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of independent Claim 1. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that *Holloway* does not disclose or even suggest “at least one of the nodes having an identification assigned thereto based on a logical assignment grouping one or more of the plurality of nodes, each node sharing an identification being commonly vulnerable to at least one network exploit” as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). In the Office Action, the Examiner refers to column 3, lines 4-5, of *Holloway* as purportedly disclosing the above-referenced limitation of Claim 1 (“see column 3, lines 4-5; where the MAC address is the ID and each node has an authorized address” (Office Action, page 5)). Applicants respectfully disagree. Column 3 of *Holloway* recites the following:

The managed hub maintains a list of authorized MAC addresses for each port in the managed hub. If the managed hub detects an unauthorized station connecting to the LAN, the hub disables the port and then transmits a security breach detected frame to the LAN security feature group address.

(*Holloway*, column 3, lines 4-9). Applicants respectfully submit that the portion of *Holloway* referred to by the Examiner, without more, does not disclose or even suggest the above-referenced limitation of Claim 1. For example, the portion of *Holloway* referred to by the Examiner appears to disclose nothing more than each port in the *Holloway* system has a MAC address. *Holloway* does not appear to disclose or even suggest, either in the portion referred to by the Examiner or elsewhere in *Holloway*, any grouping of nodes, much less a “logical

assignment grouping” of nodes, in the *Holloway* system based on a common vulnerability to a particular network exploit. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *Holloway* does not disclose or even suggest “a logical assignment grouping one or more of the plurality of nodes, each node sharing an identification being commonly vulnerable to at least one network exploit” as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that *Holloway* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Claims 2-10 that depend from independent Claim 1 are also not anticipated by *Holloway* at least because they incorporate the limitations of Claim 1 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Holloway*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-10 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicants have overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: December 16, 2005

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884